

Smoothness to the Boundary of Biholomorphic Mappings¹²

Steven G. Krantz

Abstract: Under a plausible geometric hypothesis, we show that a biholomorphic mapping of smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domains extends to a diffeomorphism of the closures.

1 Introduction

The Riemann mapping theorem (see [GRK]) tells us that the function theory of a simply connected, planar domain Ω , other than the entire plane, can be transferred from Ω to the unit disc D . But, for many questions, one needs to know the behavior of the Riemann mapping at the boundary.

The first person to take up this issue was P. Painlevé. He proved that, if the domain Ω has C^∞ boundary, then the Riemann mapping (and its inverse) extends smoothly to the boundary (see [BUR] for details of this history). Later O. Kellogg gave a proof of the result that connected the Riemann mapping with potential theory. Further on, Stefan Warschawski refined Kellogg's results and gave substantive boundary local analyses of the Riemann mapping.

It was quite some time before any progress was made on this question in the context of several complex variables. The first real theorem of a general nature was proved by C. Fefferman [FEF]. He showed that a biholomorphic mapping of smoothly bounded, strongly pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n extends to a diffeomorphism of the closures. Fefferman's work opened up a flood of developments in this subject. We only mention here that Bell [BEL] and Bell/Ligocka [BELL] were able to greatly simplify Fefferman's proof by connecting the problem in a rather direct fashion with the Bergman projection. The work of Bell and Bell/Ligocka led to a number of simplifications,

¹**Subject Classification Numbers:** 32H40, 32H02.

²**Key Words:** pseudoconvex domain, biholomorphic mapping, Lipschitz condition, smooth extension, diffeomorphism.

generalizations, and extensions of Fefferman's result. Many different mathematicians have contributed to the development of this work.

The big remaining open problem is this:

Let Ω_1 and Ω_2 in \mathbb{C}^n be smoothly bounded, (weakly Levi) pseudoconvex domains. Let $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ be a biholomorphic mapping. Does Φ extend to a diffeomorphism of the closures?

There are some counterexamples to this question—see for instance [FRI]—but these definitely do not have smooth boundary. In fact they do not even have C^2 boundary.

In the present paper we are unable to give a full answer to this main question. But we present the following somewhat encouraging partial result.

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be smoothly bounded, Levi pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . Let $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ be a biholomorphic mapping. Assume that Φ and Φ^{-1} each satisfy a Lipschitz condition of order exceeding $(n-1)/n$. Then Φ continues to a diffeomorphism of the closures of the domains.*

Corollary 1.2. *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . Let $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ be a biholomorphic mapping. Assume that Φ and Φ^{-1} each satisfy a Lipschitz condition of order 1. Then Φ continues to a diffeomorphism of the closures of the domains.*

This result is in the nature of a bootstrapping result from partial differential equations. It seems to be the first general result—for *all* pseudoconvex domains—of its kind. And it has some basis in the history of the subject. For Painlevé proved his theorem by first establishing a result for C^1 and then bootstrapping. No less an *eminence gris* than Jacques Hadamard cast public doubt on Painlevé's bootstrapping argument, and Painlevé had to work strenuously to defend his theorem. See [BUR] for the full history.

It may be noted that the hypothesis of Lipschitz continuity in the theorem is a nontrivial one. Henkin [HEN] was able to show, prior to Fefferman's celebrated result, that a biholomorphic mapping of strongly pseudoconvex domains will extend to be Lipschitz $1/2$ to the boundary. He did so by analyzing and estimating the Carathéodory metric. But there are not many results of this type.

We see that the Lipschitz condition in the theorem in case $n = 2$ meshes nicely with Henkin's result described in the last paragraph.

A final, rather significant, comment is this. Our arguments here are inspired by those in [BEL]. Bell uses global regularity ideas of Kohn which exploit weighed L^2 spaces. In the paper [BEL], a good deal of the work is expended in proving that the complex Jacobian determinant u of the mapping Φ is bounded. This fact is used in turn to prove that the complex Jacobian determinant U of the inverse mapping Φ^{-1} is nonvanishing. As we shall see below, our hypothesis of Lipschitz continuity of order exceeding $(n - 1)/n$ obviates these arguments and gets to the necessary result rather quickly. The remaining steps comprise just one paragraph on page 108 of [BEL]. We have to work a bit harder because we need to set things up in the context of Kohn's weighted L^2 spaces. But the spirit of our arguments follows Bell.

2 Condition R and Related Ideas

One of the important innovations that S. R. Bell introduced into this subject is his *Condition R*. It says this:

Condition R : Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a smoothly bounded domain. We say that Ω satisfies *Condition R* if the Bergman projection P maps $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ to $C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$. Equivalently, for each $s > 0$, there is an $S > 0$ so that the Bergman projection P maps the Sobolev space $H^{s+S}(\Omega)$ to the Sobolev space $H^s(\Omega)$.

In the paper [BEL], Bell proves the following elegant result:

Theorem 2.1. *Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . Assume that one (but not necessarily both) of these domains satisfies Condition R . Then any biholomorphic mapping $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ extends to a diffeomorphism of the closures.*

3 Ideas of Kohn

The classical treatment of the $\overline{\partial}$ -Neumann problem is based on the traditional L^2 inner product—see [FOK]. Kohn's idea in [KOH] is to use an inner product with a weight. This is inspired by work of Hörmander [HOR], and that in turn comes from old ideas of Carleman.

Kohn's setup is this (see [KOH, p. 279]). Fix a smoothly bounded domain Ω in \mathbb{C}^n . Let λ be a C^∞ , nonnegative function on a neighborhood of $\overline{\Omega}$.

Usually λ will be strictly plurisubharmonic. With λ fixed and $t \geq 0$, we shall define the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem of weight t , with real $t > 0$. We let \mathcal{A} be the space of all forms on $\bar{\Omega}$ which have C^∞ coefficients up to the boundary. For $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{A}$, we define

$$\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{(t)} \equiv \langle \phi, e^{-t\lambda} \psi \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \|\phi\|_{(t)}^2 = \langle \phi, \phi \rangle_{(t)}.$$

Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(0)}$ is the usual L^2 inner product.

It is an easily verified fact that the norms $\|\cdot\|_{(t)}$ are equivalent to the norm $\|\cdot\|_0 = \|\cdot\|$. Hence a function is in the completion under any of these norms if and only if it is square integrable. We let $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ be the Hilbert space obtained by completing \mathcal{A} under the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

The $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem may be set up in the $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(t)}$ inner product rather than the usual L^2 inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. These are familiar ideas, and the details are provided in [KOH]. One of the main points that must be noted is that the *formal adjoint* of the operator $\bar{\partial}$, when calculated in the $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(t)}$ inner product, is

$$\mathcal{I}_t = \mathcal{I} - t\sigma(\mathcal{I}, d\lambda).$$

Here σ is the “symbol” in the usual sense of pseudodifferential operators. We thus see how the parameter t comes into play. If t is chosen positive and large enough, then certain terms in the usual $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann estimates can be forced to dominate certain others. Again see [KOH] for the details.

Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domains and $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ a biholomorphic mapping which is bi-Lipschitz of order exceeding $(n-1)/n$. We shall apply the preceding ideas on Ω_2 with $\lambda(z) = |z|^2$ and on Ω_1 with $\lambda(z) = |\Phi(z)|^2$.

In this context we shall refer to the Bergman projection as $P_{t,1}$ (for Ω_1) and $P_{t,2}$ (for Ω_2). We shall also call Bell’s regularity condition “Condition R_t .” We shall denote the Bergman kernels by $K_{t,1}$ and $K_{t,2}$. As a result of these ideas, the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on Ω_2 , formulated with the indicated weight λ , satisfies favorable estimates (this follows from [KOH]) as long as t is large enough. Hence Ω_2 satisfies Condition R_t . Bell also makes use of these facts.

These are the tools that we shall need in the next section to get to our result.

In what follows we shall take it that we are working with the Bergman theory for the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(t)}$ for t sufficiently large, and that Ω_2 satisfies

Condition R_t . We formulate this last by saying that $P_{t,2} : H^{m(s)}(\Omega) \rightarrow H^s(\Omega)$ for any $s \geq 0$ and suitable $m(s) \geq s$.

Sometimes, in what follows, we will talk about **(i)** a domain Ω with weight λ but make no reference to **(ii)** Ω_1 , Ω_2 , or the mapping Φ . We will later apply **(i)** to **(ii)**.

4 The Guts of the Proof

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Omega \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be smoothly bounded and pseudoconvex. Suppose that the λ from the weight on Ω is smooth on Ω . Assume that Ω satisfies Condition R_t with respect to the projection P_t . Let $w \in \Omega$ be fixed. Let K_t denote the Bergman kernel. Then there is a constant $C_w > 0$ so that*

$$\|K_t(w, \cdot)\|_{\sup} \leq C_w.$$

Proof: The function $K(z, \cdot)$ is harmonic. Let $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a radial, C^∞ function centered at w and supported in Ω so that the radius of the support is comparable to half the distance of w to the boundary. Assume that $\varphi \geq 0$ and $\int \varphi(\zeta) dV(\zeta) = 1$. Then the mean value property implies that

$$K_t(z, w) = \int_{\Omega} K_t(z, \zeta) \varphi(\zeta) dV(\zeta) = \int_{\Omega} K_t(z, \zeta) [\varphi(\zeta) e^{t\lambda(\zeta)}] e^{-t\lambda(\zeta)} dV(\zeta).$$

Of course this last displayed expression equals $P_t\left(\varphi(\cdot) e^{t\lambda(\cdot)}\right)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_t(w, \cdot)\|_{\sup} &= \sup_{z \in \Omega} |K_t(w, z)| \\ &= \sup_{z \in \Omega} |K_t(z, w)| \\ &= \sup_{z \in \Omega} |P_t[\varphi(\cdot) e^{t\lambda(\cdot)}]|. \end{aligned}$$

By Sobolev's theorem, this last is

$$\leq C(\Omega, w) \|P_t[\varphi(\cdot) e^{t\lambda(\cdot)}]\|_{W^{2n+1}}.$$

By Condition R_t , this is

$$\leq C(\Omega, w) \cdot \|\varphi(\cdot) e^{t\lambda(\cdot)}\|_{W^{m(2n+1)}} \equiv C_w.$$

□

Remark: It is worth noting that the estimate obtained in this last proof depends on some derivatives of λ on a compact set. In practice this causes no harm. We only need to know that $\|K_t(w, \cdot)\|_{\sup}$ is bounded so that we can perform an integration by parts in the proof of Lemma 4.2 below.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ be arbitrary. Let $s \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Then there is a $v \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $P_t v = 0$ and the functions u and v agree to order s on $\partial\Omega$.*

Proof: This lemma is the key to Bell's approach to these matters. We will need to expend some effort to adapt Bell's ideas to the new weighted context.

We of course assume that our domain Ω is equipped with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{(t)}$ based on a weight $e^{-t\lambda}$.

After a partition of unity, it suffices to prove the assertion in a small neighborhood W of $z_0 \in \partial\Omega$. After a rotation, we may assume that $\partial\rho/\partial z_1 \neq 0$ on $W \cap \overline{\Omega}$. [Here ρ is a defining function for the domain Ω —see [KRA1].]

Define the differential operator

$$\nu = \frac{\operatorname{Re} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_j} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \right\}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \left| \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial z_j} \right|^2}.$$

Observe that $\nu\rho \equiv 1$. Now we shall define v by induction on s . In what follows, we shall make use of the differential operator

$$T = \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta_1} + t \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \zeta_1}.$$

For the case $s = 0$, we set

$$w_1 = \frac{\rho u}{T\rho}.$$

If W is small then of course $T\rho$ will not vanish. Also define

$$v_1 = Tw_1 = u + \mathcal{O}(\rho).$$

Then we see immediately that u and v_1 agree to order 0 on $\partial\Omega$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_t v_1 &= \int K_t(z, \zeta) T w_1 e^{-t\lambda} dV \\ &= - \int T_\zeta [K_t(z, \zeta) e^{-t\lambda}] w_1 dV \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The penultimate equality comes from integration by parts. This operation is justified by Lemma 4.1. Note that T_ζ annihilates $K_t(z, \zeta) e^{-t\lambda(\zeta)}$ by a simple calculation (using the fact that $K_t(z, \zeta)$ is conjugate holomorphic in the ζ variable).

Now suppose inductively that

$$\begin{aligned} w_{s-1} &= w_{s-2} + \theta_{s-1} \cdot \rho^s, \\ v_{s-1} &= T w_{s-1} \end{aligned}$$

(for some smooth function θ_{s-1}). We construct

$$w_s = w_{s-1} + \theta_s \rho^{s+1}$$

so that

$$v_s \equiv T w_s$$

agrees to order $s - 1$ with u on $\partial\Omega$.

By the inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} v_s &= T w_s \\ &= T w_{s-1} + T(\theta_s \rho^{s+1}) \\ &= v_{s-1} + \rho^s [(s+1)\theta_s T \rho + \rho T \theta_s]. \end{aligned}$$

This expression agrees, by the inductive hypothesis, with u to order $s - 1$ on $\partial\Omega$. We now must examine $D(u - v_s)$, where D is any s -order differential operator. There are two cases:

Case 1: Assume that D involves a tangential derivative D_0 . Then we may write $D = D_0 D_1$. Then

$$D(u - v_s) = D_0 \alpha,$$

where α vanishes on $\partial\Omega$. But then it follows that $D_0 \alpha = 0$ because D_0 is tangential.

Case 2: Now assume that D has no tangential derivative in it. So we take $D = \nu^s$, where ν was defined at the beginning of this discussion. Our job is to choose θ_s so that

$$\nu^s(u - v_s) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

So we require that

$$\nu^s(u - v_{s-1}) - \nu^s(T(\theta_s \rho^{s+1})) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

This is the same as

$$\nu^s(u - v_{s-1}) - \theta_s(\nu^s T \rho^{s+1}) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

or

$$\nu^s(u - v_{s-1}) - \theta_s \left(\nu^s \frac{\partial}{\partial \zeta_1} \rho^{s+1} \right) - \theta_s \left(\nu^s t \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \zeta_1} \rho^{s+1} \right) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

This may be rewritten as

$$\nu^s(u - v_{s-1}) - \theta_s(s+1)! \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \zeta_1} - t \cdot \theta_s \cdot \tau \cdot \rho,$$

where τ stands for terms that come from the differentiations. The last line may be rewritten as

$$\theta_s = \frac{\nu^s(u - v_{s-1})}{(s+1)! \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \zeta_1} + t \cdot \tau \cdot \rho}.$$

If W is small enough then the denominator cannot vanish and we see that we have a well-defined choice for θ_s as desired. \square

We note that, in [BEL], Bell has a particularly elegant way of expressing the content of this last lemma. His formulation will be useful for us later, so we formulate it now. First some notation.

If $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is a domain (a connected, open set), then let $W^s(\Omega)$ denote the usual Sobolev space of functions on Ω . Finally, let $W_0^s(\Omega)$ be the closure of $C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ in $W^s(\Omega)$. Now we have Bell's formulation of our Lemma 4.2:

Corollary 4.3. *Let Ω be a smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domain. Let $s \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Then there is a linear operator $\Psi^s : H^s(\Omega) \rightarrow W_0^s(\Omega)$ such that $P_t \Psi^s = \text{id}$.*

For the rest of this discussion, we let Ω_1 and Ω_2 be fixed, smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . We fix a strictly plurisubharmonic function $\lambda(z) = |z|^2$, and we equip Ω_2 with the inner product with weight $e^{-t\lambda(z)}$. We assume that there is a biholomorphic mapping $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ that extends in a bi-Lipschitzian fashion, of order greater than $(n-1)/n$, to the boundary, and we equip Ω_1 with the inner product with weight $e^{-t\lambda(\Phi(z))}$. We let $P_{t,1}$ and $P_{t,2}$ be the resulting Bergman projections for Ω_1, Ω_2 respectively. We let u denote the complex Jacobian determinant of Φ . And we let U denote the complex Jacobian determinant of Φ^{-1} . So u is a complex-valued holomorphic function on Ω_1 and U is a complex-valued holomorphic function on Ω_2 . Finally, for $j = 1, 2$, we let $\delta_j(z) = \delta_{\Omega_j}(z) = \text{dist}(z, \partial\Omega_j)$ for $z \in \Omega_j$.

Lemma 4.4. *The Bergman kernels for the two domains are related by*

$$K_{t,1}(z, \zeta) = u(z) \cdot K_{t,2}(\Phi(z), \Phi(\zeta)) \cdot \overline{u(\zeta)}. \quad (4.4.1)$$

Proof: This is a standard change-of-variables argument, using the canonical relationship between the real Jacobian determinant of a biholomorphic mapping and the complex Jacobian determinant of that mapping (see Lemma 1.4.10 of [KRA1]).

Now, if f is a Bergman space function on Ω_1 , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega_1} [u(z) K_{t,2}(\Phi(z), \Phi(\zeta)) \overline{u(\zeta)}] f(\zeta) e^{-t\lambda(\Phi(\zeta))} dV(\zeta) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_2} u(z) K_{t,2}(\Phi(z), \xi) \overline{u(\Phi^{-1}(\xi))} \\ & \quad \times f(\Phi^{-1}(\xi)) u^{-1}(\xi) \overline{u^{-1}(\xi)} e^{-t\lambda(\xi)} dV(\xi) \\ &= f(z) u(z) u^{-1}(\Phi(z)) \\ &= f(z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that the righthand side of (4.4.1) has the reproducing property on Ω_1 . It is also conjugate symmetric and is an element of the Bergman space in the first variable. Therefore it must equal $K_{t,1}(z, \zeta)$. \square

Lemma 4.5. *For any function $g \in L^2(\Omega_2)$, we have*

$$P_{t,1}(u \cdot (g \circ \Phi)) = u \cdot ((P_{t,2}(g) \circ \Phi)) .$$

Proof: We use the preceding lemma to calculate that

$$\begin{aligned} u(z) \cdot ((P_{t,2}(g) \circ \Phi)(z)) &= u(z) \int_{\Omega_2} K_{t,2}(\Phi(z), \zeta) g(\zeta) e^{-t\lambda(\zeta)} dV(\zeta) \\ &= u(z) \int_{\Omega_2} u(z)^{-1} K_{t,1}(z, \Phi^{-1}(\xi)) \overline{u(\Phi(\xi))}^{-1} \\ &\quad \times g(\zeta) e^{-t\lambda(\zeta)} dV(\zeta) \\ &= u(z) \int_{\Omega_1} u(z)^{-1} K_{t,1}(z, \xi) \overline{u(\xi)}^{-1} \\ &\quad \times g(\Phi(\xi)) e^{-t\lambda(\Phi(\xi))} u(\xi) \overline{u(\xi)} dV(\xi) \\ &= \int_{\Omega_1} K_{t,1}(z, \xi) g(\Phi(\xi)) u(\xi) e^{-t\lambda(\Phi(\xi))} dV(\xi) \\ &= P_{t,1}(u \cdot (g \circ \Phi))(z) . \end{aligned}$$

That establishes the result. \square

It will be useful to have the following corollary, in which Φ is replaced by Φ^{-1} (and of course the corresponding Bergman kernels switch roles):

Corollary 4.6. *Let U denote the complex Jacobian determinant of Φ^{-1} . Then, for any function $g \in L^2(\Omega_1)$, we have*

$$P_{t,2}(U \cdot (g \circ \Phi^{-1})) = U \cdot ((P_{t,1}(g) \circ \Phi^{-1})) .$$

Lemma 4.7. *Let $H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_1)$ denote the space of holomorphic functions on Ω_1 which extend smoothly to $\overline{\Omega}_1$. Let $s \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. If $h \in H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_1)$, then let $\phi_s = \Psi^s h$, where Ψ^s is introduced in Corollary 4.3. Then*

$$U \cdot (h \circ \Phi^{-1}) = P_{t,2}(U \cdot (\phi_s \circ \Phi^{-1})) .$$

Proof: We calculate, using Corollary 4.6, that

$$P_{t,2}(U \cdot (\phi_s \circ \Phi^{-1})) = U \cdot (P_{t,1}(\phi_s) \circ \Phi^{-1}) = U \cdot (P_{t,1}(\Psi^s h) \circ \Phi^{-1}) = U \cdot (h \circ \Phi^{-1}) .$$

\square

The next lemma has nothing to do with Condition R . It is really only calculus.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose that $\Phi^{-1} : \Omega_2 \rightarrow \Omega_1$ is a biholomorphic mapping between smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domains in \mathbb{C}^n . Assume that Φ is bi-Lipschitz of order exceeding $(n-1)/n$. Let U denote the complex Jacobian determinant of Φ^{-1} . For each nonnegative integer s , there is an integer $N = N(s)$ such that the operator*

$$g \longmapsto U \cdot (g \circ \Phi^{-1})$$

is bounded from $W_0^{s+N}(\Omega_1)$ to $W_0^s(\Omega_2)$.

Proof: Since the components of Φ^{-1} are holomorphic and Lipschitz of order exceeding $(n-1)/n$, the derivatives of Φ^{-1} satisfy finite growth conditions at the boundary (see[GOL]). That is to say

$$\left| \frac{\partial^\alpha \Phi^{-1}}{\partial w^\alpha}(w) \right| \leq C \cdot d_2(w)^{-k+(n-1)/n}. \quad (4.8.1)$$

Here α is a multi-index, $k = |\alpha|$, and d_j is the distance of the argument to the boundary of Ω_j , $j = 1, 2$. Estimates like this one go back to Hardy and Littlewood (see [GOL]).

Now Sobolev's lemma and Taylor's formula tell us that, for $g \in W_0^{s+|\alpha|+n}(\Omega_1)$,

$$|D^\alpha g(z)| \leq C \cdot \|g\|_{s+|\alpha|+n} d_1(z)^s.$$

For a given s , in order to show that an N exists so that $g \mapsto U \cdot (g \circ \Phi^{-1})$ is bounded from $W_0^{s+N}(\Omega_1)$ to $W_0^s(\Omega_2)$, it will suffice to show that there is an integer $m > 0$ such that $d_1(\Phi^{-1}(w))^m \leq C \cdot d_2(w)$. That such an m exists is proved by Range [RAN1, Lemma 3.1]. The proof, naturally, consists of applying Hopf's lemma to $\rho \circ \Phi^{-1}$, where ρ is a bounded, plurisubharmonic exhaustion function for Ω_2 of the form $v d_2^{1/m}$ with $v \in C^\infty(\overline{\Omega_2})$ and $v < 0$ on $\overline{\Omega_2}$. Of course Diederich and Fornæss [DIF] have proved the existence of such an exhaustion function. Range [RAN2] has given a simpler approach to the matter, with the penalty of assuming greater boundary smoothness.

That completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Let $s \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. With notation as above,*

$$\|U \cdot (h \circ \Phi^{-1})\|_s \leq \|h\|_{s+N}.$$

Proof: We note that Kohn's theory (see [BEL] for the details) entails that $P_{t,2}$ maps $H^s(\Omega_2)$ to $H^s(\Omega_2)$ for t sufficiently large and any s .

Now we apply Lemma 4.7 and then Lemma 4.8 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|U \cdot (h \circ \Phi^{-1})\|_s &\leq \|P_{t,2}(U \cdot (\phi_s \circ \Phi^{-1}))\|_s \\ &\leq \|U \cdot (\phi_s \circ \Phi^{-1})\|_s \\ &\leq \|\phi_s\|_{s+N} \\ &= \|\Psi^s h\|_{s+N} \\ &\leq \|h\|_{s+N}. \end{aligned}$$

In the second inequality we use Condition R_t . In the third inequality here we use Lemma 4.8. That completes the argument. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1: The last lemma tells us that $U \cdot (h \circ \Phi^{-1}) \in H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_2)$ if $h \in H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_1)$. Taking $h \equiv 1$, we conclude immediately that $U \in H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_2)$.

Next take $h = w_j$, where w_j is the j^{th} coordinate function on Ω_2 . We conclude now that

$$U \cdot (\Phi^{-1})_j \in H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_2). \quad (4.10)$$

Fix a point $z \in \Omega_1$. The fact that $\Phi : \Omega_1 \rightarrow \Omega_2$ is Lipschitz of order greater than $(n-1)/n$ tells us that

$$|\nabla \Phi(z)| \leq C \cdot \delta_1(z)^{-1/n+\epsilon}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Hence the complex Jacobian determinant u of Φ at z is bounded by $d_1^{-1+\epsilon'}(z)$ for some $\epsilon' > 0$. We know from results of Range [RAN1], proved with a direct application of Hopf's lemma, that $d_1(\Phi^{-1}(w))^m \leq C \cdot d_2(w)$ for some positive integer m . But in fact the bi-Lipschitz condition of order exceeding $(n-1)/n$ guarantees that m must be 1.

It follows then that U must be of size at least $d_2^{1-\epsilon'}$ if it vanishes at some point of $\partial\Omega_2$ (it cannot vanish in the interior). That contradicts the smoothness of U to the boundary. We conclude then that U cannot vanish.

Hence it is bounded from 0 in modulus. So we may see from (4.10) that $(\Phi^{-1})_j$ is in $H^\infty(\overline{\Omega}_2)$. Hence Φ^{-1} extends smoothly to $\overline{\Omega}_2$.

Of course a similar argument may be applied with Φ^{-1} replace by Φ and the roles of Ω_1 and Ω_2 reversed to see that Φ extends smoothly to $\overline{\Omega}_1$. That completes the proof of our theorem. \square

We remark that, if we strengthen the hypotheses of our theorem to Φ and Φ^{-1} both being Lipschitz 1, then it is immediate that u and U are bounded and the proof simplifies notably. Having a Lipschitz condition of order less than 1 makes things a bit trickier.

A final comment is this. If $\Phi : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ is a biholomorphic self-map (an automorphism) of a fixed, smoothly bounded, pseudoconvex domain Ω , and if Φ is Lipschitz of order some $\epsilon > 0$, then $\Phi^{[(n-1)/(n\epsilon)]+1}$ is Lipschitz of order exceeding $(n-1)/n$ (and its inverse satisfies a similar condition). Our theorem then implies that $\Phi^{[(n-1)/(n\epsilon)]+1}$ is C^∞ to $\overline{\Omega}$ (and similarly for the inverse mapping).

5 Concluding Remarks

It would be natural to suppose that a theorem like the one that we prove here is actually valid with only the assumption that Φ and Φ^{-1} are Lipschitz of order ϵ for some $\epsilon > 0$. The methods that we have do not suffice to establish such a result.

We repeat that, of course, the hope is that no Lipschitz hypothesis should be needed. The conclusion should be true all the time. That question will be a topic for future research.

REFERENCES

- [**BEL**] S. R. Bell, Biholomorphic mappings and the $\bar{\partial}$ problem, *Ann. Math.*, 114(1981), 103-113.
- [**BELL**] S. R. Bell and E. Ligocka, A simplification and extension of Fefferman's theorem on biholomorphic mappings, *Invent. Math.* 57(1980), 283–289.
- [**BUR**] R. B. Burckel, *An Introduction to Classical Complex Analysis*, Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [**DIF**] K. Diederich and J. E. Fornæss, Pseudoconvex domains: Bounded strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions, *Invent. Math.* 39(1977), 129–141.
- [**FEF**] C. Fefferman, The Bergman kernel and biholomorphic mappings of pseudoconvex domains, *Invent. Math.* 26(1974), 1–65.
- [**FOK**] G. B. Folland and J. J. Kohn, *The Neumann Problem for the Cauchy-Riemann Complex*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972.
- [**FRI**] B. Fridman, Biholomorphic transformations that do not extend continuously to the boundary, *Michigan Math. J.* 38(1991), 67–73.
- [**GOL**] G. M. Goluzin, *Geometric Theory of Functions of a Complex Variable*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1969.
- [**GRK**] R. E. Greene and S. G. Krantz, *Function Theory of One Complex Variable*, 3rd ed., American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
- [**HEN**] G. M. Henkin, An analytic polyhedron is not holomorphically equivalent to a strictly pseudoconvex domain, (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 210(1973), 1026–1029.
- [**HOR**] L. Hörmander, L^2 estimates and existence theorems for the $\bar{\partial}$ operator, *Acta Math.* 113(1965), 89–152. w
- [**KOH**] J. J. Kohn, Global regularity for $\bar{\partial}$ on weakly pseudo-convex manifolds, *Trans. AMS* 181(1973), 273–292.

- [KRA1] S. G. Krantz, *Function Theory of Several Complex Variables*, 2nd ed., American Mathematical Society, Providenc, RI, 2001.
- [RAN1] R. M. Range, The Carathéodory metric and holomorphic maps on a class of weakly pseudoconvex domains, *Pacific J. Math.* 78(1978), 173–189.
- [RAN2] R. M. Range, A remark on bounded strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions, *Proc. AMS* 81(1981), 220–222.
- [ROM] S. Roman, The formula of Faà di Bruno, *Am. Math. Monthly* 87(1980), 805-809.

Steven G. Krantz
Department of Mathematics
Washington University in St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
sk@math.wustl.edu